REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17 and 20 were pending. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 were previously canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. By this Amendment, new dependent claims 21 and 22 have been added. New dependent claims 21 and 22 clarify the claimed invention of claim 1, without narrowing the scope of the claimed invention and without introducing new issues. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17 and 20-22 are now pending, with claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 17 and 20 in independent form.

Applicant maintains that no new matter is introduced by this Amendment. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 5, lines 2-7, page 6, lines 8-11, and page 8, lines 13-17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

On page 3 of the January 25, 2005 final Office Action, claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,423 to Sampson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,260 to Sasmazel et al.

In reference to claims 1, 7, 14, 17 and 20, the Office Action states that Sampson discloses an access authentication system for providing a client with a service of connection to a terminal server. The Office Action further states that the system includes a first authentication server for determining whether or not the client should be connected to the first terminal server, on the basis of personal information input by the client to the first terminal server. The Office Action also states that the

first authentication server creating first ticket data by encoding a client parameter, which includes part of the personal information, on the basis of a predetermined formula. The Office Action further states that the access control 240 performs the function of the authentication server by determining if the browser is authenticated. The Office Action states that the access control also sends the browser a cookie that is encrypted therefore encoded personal information using a predetermined formula. The Office Action also states that Sampson creates a second cookie by encoding the client parameter on the basis of a predetermined formula when the browser tries to connect to a new domain.

The Office Action acknowledges that Sampson does not expressly disclose transferring the ticket to the web server, checking whether the ticket is used, and supplying the web server with information indicative of whether the second terminal server should be connected to the client. The Office Action further acknowledges that Sampson discloses a cookie (ticket) with user data, Sampson does not expressly disclose the data in the cookie encoded using a summarization using a one-way function.

The Office Action states that Sasmazel discloses a system of transferring the eticket from server to server. The Office Action further states that the information in the eticket of Sasmazel is hashed (summarization using a one-way function) and encrypted (one-way function). The Office Action also states that the eticket of Sasmazel is transferred to the second terminal server by the first sending it to the browser and then the browser sends the ticket to the web server 220 or 240.

The Office Action states that the second authorization server

(360), which performs the function of the second authentication server of detecting whether or not client parameter is valid and whether or not the first ticket data has been used. The Office Action further states that Sasmazel checks whether the user is in session, which is a method of checking whether the eticket has been used. The Office Action states that the web server is then supplied data indicative of whether or not the second terminal server should be connected to the client. The Office Action also states that Sasmazel stores in a file information for authenticating the user and therefore first ticket data. The Office Action further states that comparing the first and second ticket data includes checking the validity of the ticket.

The Office Action states that the system of Sasmazel discloses the client parameter includes at least one of ID information of the client, and access-originator IP address and an expiration date set for the first ticket data. The Office Action further states that the system of Sasmazel suggests the common character string is changed at a predetermined point in time.

The Office Action alleges that at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to transfer the ticket information to the web server, check whether the ticket is used and supply the web server with information indicative of whether the second terminal server should be connected to the client as in the system of Sasmazel in the system of Sampson. The Office Action further alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the ticket may be securely passed from server to server without the user having to re-authenticate.

In reference to claim 6, which is rejected as the rejection for

claim one. The Office Action further states that in addition, Sampson discloses a system wherein the user may enter logon information. The Office Action also states that logon information includes an ID and a password entered by the client. The Office Action further states that the ticket disclosed by Sasmazel that is transported from server to server includes an expiration date; and a common character string in the form of a public signature. The Office Action states that since the ticket includes ID information and the system checks whether as user is in session. The Office Action also states that the system of Sasmazel therefore compares the access-originator IP address provided in the ticket which is sent to the second terminal server this would result in determining whether or not access by the client has been executed on or before the expiration date.

In reference to claim 10, wherein the second authentication means judges validity of the first ticket data, the Office Action acknowledges that Sampson does not expressly disclose the second authentication means judges validity of the first ticket data.

The Office Action states that Sasmazel stores in a file information for authenticating the user and therefore first ticket data. The Office Action further states that comparing the first and second ticket data includes checking the validity of the ticket. The Office Action also states that this suggests the second authentication means judges the validity of the first ticket data.

The Office Action alleges that at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to judge the validity of the first ticket data as shown in Sasmazel in the system of Sampson. The Office Action further

alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to this because checking the validity of the ticket would expose any attempt to carry out fraud.

In reference to claim 11, wherein the second authentication means judges legality of the client parameter, the Office Action states that since the validity of the ticket is checked it follows that the legality of the client parameter is check.

Applicant maintains that the cited references do not render the claimed invention unpatentable. The claimed invention is patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

The present application relates to access authentication when service is provided to connect a client to a second terminal server via a first terminal server. In many instances, the client will want to obtain the benefit of services from plural terminal servers, since generally no single server can provide all of the services that the client would want. However, the client is typically contracted with the first terminal server for receiving services from the first terminal server, but is not contracted with the second terminal server (or additional terminal servers). In addition, the client may not wish to connect directly to the second terminal server for other reasons (such as convenience). For example, in order to connect directly to a terminal server, the client typically is required to supply personal information, such as ID information and password, to the terminal server. Therefore, if the client seeks the services of plural terminal servers, it is very inconvenient for the client to connect directly to the plural terminal servers, each of which would require the client to enter the personal information.

Applicant devised improved techniques which enable a client to obtain services from plural terminal servers, without having to enter personal information plural times for the respective plural terminal servers. The claimed invention of the present application provides for authentication by transferring client parameter and first ticket data created by a first authentication server (associated with the first terminal server) to a second authentication server (associated with the second terminal server). The first authorization server transfers the first ticket data and the client parameter directly to the second authorization server without going through the client. Based on the first ticket data and the client parameter, the second authentication server determines whether or not the second terminal server is should be connected to the client. Thus, assuming the first ticket data and the client parameter are authenticated by the second authentication server, the client can be connected to, and obtain the services of, the second terminal server via the first terminal server.

Sampson and Sasmazel do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention because neither references disclose or suggest connecting the client to the second terminal server via the first terminal server.

Sampson, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a multi-domain access control scheme. In the access scheme of Sampson, a first server transmits a data token to client which seeks to obtain access to a resource in a second domain. The client uses the data token to connect to a second server in the second domain. The second server uses the data token to check that the client is authentic and should be given access to resources in the second domain. After issuing the data token, the first

server is not involved in the connection by the client to the second domain.

Moreover, Sampson does not disclose or suggest that the first server transfers first ticket data and client parameter to the second server, as provided by the claimed invention of this application.

Sasmazel, as understood by Applicant, is directed to an eticket architecture for issuing authenticated electronic tickets in a distributed computing system and updating user authentication and/or authorization. As pointed out in the Office Action, when the eticket is created or updated in the Sasmazel eticket architecture by a first authentication server, the eticket is transferred by the first authentication server to the client browser, and the client browser then must send the ticket to a second authentication server in order to obtain the services of the associated second terminal server.

Applicant does not find teaching or suggestion in Sasmazel or Sampson of an access authentication system or method wherein the client is connected to the second terminal server via the first terminal server. Both Sasmazel and Sampson relies on the client to connect to the second terminal server after obtaining the data token or eticket from the first server.

Therefore, Sampson and Sasmazel, considered singly or in combination, fail to teach or render obvious all features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the claim amendments and remarks hereinabove, Applicant maintains that the application is now in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicant's undersigned attorneys invite the Examiner to telephone them at the telephone number provided below.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Amendment. However, if any additional fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. White, Reg. No. 28,678
Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorneys for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham, LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 278-0400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile transmission and is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

April 7, 2005
Date

Paul Teng
Reg. No. 40,837